

REMARKS

Claims in this case are 1-12, all of which are presented here for initial consideration.

The claims in the parent case were rejected under 35 USC § 112 and 35 USC § 102 (Multer).

The rejection under 35 USC § 112 is not understood. It was applied to the language “said comparing step---” in the parent claims 1, 12, and 17. However, no such step can be found in those claims.

In any event, in the current claims, the recited “comparing” functions are disclosed in the specification at page 31, bottom, to page 32, line 5 (also see pp. 28, line 2 and pp. 7, mid page).

Considering Multer (6,757,696), the reference discloses a comprehensive system of synchronization that includes synchronizing a PDA 804, (Fig. 8, specification col. 9, line 8).

Also in Multer, a set of programs are specifically designed to transmit differencing data from one device to another (col. 4, line 44) controlled by a user (col. 12, line 29; col. 13, line 20; col. 36, line 13; claim 1).

The system defined by the claims herein is quite distinct by: controlled time operations for automatically synchronizing an electronic device; using a host computer to implement conduits for attaining the synchronization and by recording newer versions (rather than mere differences).

On the basis of the present claims explicitly defining these distinctions, consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: October 21, 2007

By: /Byard G. Nilsson/
Byard G. Nilsson
Registration No. 17,350

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860